PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To: GREGORY A. HUNT	PCI			
JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A. SUITE 1200, UNIVERSITY TOWER 3100 TOWER BOULEVARD DURHAM, NC 27707	NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT AND THE WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY, OR THE DECLARATION			
	(PCT Rule 44.1)			
	Date of mailing (day/month/year) 29 APR 2008			
Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR EVIDTUED ACTION Comments Lond Abelow			
1497/38 PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraphs 1 and 4 below			
International application No.	International filing date			
PCT/US 07/26413	(day/month/year) 28 December 2007 (28.12.2007)			
Applicant GENBAND INC.				
The applicant is hereby notified that the international search Authority have been established and are transmitted here.	earch report and the written opinion of the International Searching rewith.			
Filing of amendments and statement under Article 19:				
The applicant is entitled, if he so wishes, to amend the When? The time limit for filing such amendme	claims of the international application (see Rule 46):  nts is normally two months from the date of transmittal of the			
international search report.				
Where? Directly to the International Bureau of WI 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland, Facsimile N				
For more detailed instructions, see the notes on the	accompanying sheet.			
2. The applicant is hereby notified that no international Article 17(2)(a) to that effect and the written opinion of	2. The applicant is hereby notified that no international search report will be established and that the declaration under Article 17(2)(a) to that effect and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority are transmitted herewith.			
3. With regard to the protest against payment of (an) ad	ditional fee(s) under Rule 40.2, the applicant is notified that:			
	as been transmitted to the International Bureau together with the he protest and the decision thereon to the designated Offices.			
no decision has been made yet on the protest; the	ne applicant will be notified as soon as a decision is made.			
4. Reminders				
International Bureau. If the applicant wishes to avoid or p	ity date, the international application will be published by the ostpone publication, a notice of withdrawal of the international nal Bureau as provided in Rules 90bis.1 and 90bis.3, respectively, ational publication.			
International Bureau. The International Bureau will send	the written opinion of the International Searching Authority to the a copy of such comments to all designated Offices unless an be established. These comments would also be made available to priority date.			
examination must be filed if the applicant wishes to postpone	f some designated Offices, a demand for international preliminary the entry into the national phase until 30 months from the priority st, within 20 months from the priority date, perform the prescribed Offices.			
	nonths (or later) will apply even if no demand is filed within 19			
See the Annex to Form PCT/IB/301 and, for details about the <i>Guide</i> , Volume II, National Chapters and the WIPO Internet s	applicable time limits, Office by Office, see the PCT Applicant's site.			
Name and mailing address of the ISA/US	Authorized officer:			

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300 PCT OSP: 571-272-7774

Lee W. Young

Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

Form PCT/ISA/220 (January 2004)

DOCKET DATES: 6/28; 7/28/08 - 1 EM ASSIGNED ATTY: GAH / JK-FILE NO. 1497/38 PUT DOCKETED BY: PEL DATE: 516/08 \$ 105 dol for 1497/38/2 15 7/29/08

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# PCT

### INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 1497/38 PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION	as well	see Form PCT/ISA/220 as, where applicable, item 5 below.
International application No. PCT/US 07/26413	International filing date (day/mo 28 December 2007 (28.12.2007)	onth/year)	(Earliest) Priority Date (day/month/year) 28 December 2006 (28.12.2006)
Applicant GENBAND INC.			1
according to Article 18. A copy is bein This international search report consist	s of a total of sheets. a copy of each prior art document be international search was carried oblication in the language in which international application into seed for the purposes of international report has been established taking to this Authority under Rule 91 (Retide and/or amino acid sequence and unsearchable (see Box No. II).	cited in this out on the basis was filed. It search (Rugginto accounts 43.6bis(adisclosed in	which is the language of ales 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).  unt the rectification of an obvious mistake
may, within one month from  6. With regard to the drawings,  a. the figure of the drawings to be as suggested by the as selected by this A	ed, according to Rule 38.2(b), by t m the date of mailing of this intern e published with the abstract is Fig applicant. uthority, because the applicant fai	ational search ure No. <u>6</u>	
	uthority, because this figure better published with the abstract.	characterize	es the invention.

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

			PCT/US 07	/26413
IPC(8) - USPC -	SSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER H01L 29/08 (2008.01) 455/414.4 to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both n	ational classification a	nd IPC	
	DS SEARCHED			
	ocumentation searched (classification system followed by 1L 29/08 (2008.01) /414.4	classification symbols)		•
Documentat USPC - 455	ion searched other than minimum documentation to the ex //403, 414.1, 414.4, 432.2, 452.2; 370/310, 312, 332, 39	ctent that such document 5.21	s are included in the	fields searched
PubWEST(F Search Terr	ata base consulted during the international search (name of PGPB,USPT,USOC,EPAB,JPAB); Google Scholar as Used: silence insertion descriptor, tandem-free operallular, comfort noise etc.			
C. DOCU	MENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT			
Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where ap	opropriate, of the releva	ınt passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	US 2005/0084094 A1 (Gass et al.) 21 April 2005 (21.0	4.2005), para. [0031], [0	0037], [0041]	1-15
Y	US 2004/0110539 A1 (El-Maleh et al.) 10 June 2004 (	10.06.2004), para. [002	3], [0032]	1-5, 10-15
Y	US 2001/0043577 A1 (Barany et al.) 22 November 200	01 (22.11.2001), para. [	0131], [0133]	3, 4, 6-9, 12, 13
Y	US 2004/0133419 A1 (El-Maleh et al.) 8 July 2004 (08	.07.2004), para. [0028]		5, 9, 14
i				
Furthe	er documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.			•
"A" docume	categories of cited documents: ent defining the general state of the art which is not considered f particular relevance	date and not in co	blished after the inter inflict with the applic eory underlying the	national filing date or priority ation but cited to understand invention
ł	application or patent but published on or after the international	"X" document of part considered novel	icular relevance; the	claimed invention cannot be ered to involve an inventive
cited to special	ent which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is o establish the publication date of another citation or other reason (as specified)	"Y" document of part considered to in	icular relevance; the	claimed invention cannot be step when the document is documents, such combination
means "P" docume	ent referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other ent published prior to the international filing date but later than prity date claimed	being obvious to	a person skilled in the r of the same patent	e art
	actual completion of the international search	Date of mailing of the		
03 April 200	8 (03.04.2008)		29 APR 2	008
	nailing address of the ISA/US	Authorized officer	: Lee W. Young	
	T, Attn: ISA/US, Commissioner for Patents i0, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	PCT Helpdesk; 571-272-4300	•	Nas

PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300 PCT OSP: 571-272-7774

Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To: GREGORY A. HUNT JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A. SUITE 1200, UNIVERSITY TOWER 3100 TOWER BOULEVARD DURHAM, NC 27707  Date of mailing [daylmonth/spear] [Authorized Hunting of the priority date (daylmonth/spear) [Authorized Hunting of the priority date, whichever the applicability; inventive step or industrial applicability; inventive step or industrial applicability; inventive step or industrial applicability; date (daylmonth/spear) [Authorized Hunting of the priority date, whichever the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 68.16x(b) that written options of this International Searching Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.16x(b) that written options of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considere	Interview .				
GREGORY A. HUNT JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A. SUITE 1200, UNIVERSITY TOWER 3100 TOWER BOULEVARD DURHAM, NC 27707  Date of mailing day/month/year)  Applicant's or agent's file reference 1497/38 PCT  International application No. PCT/US 07/26413  International application No. PCT/US 07/26413  International application (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(8) - HOIL 29/08 (2008.01)  USPC - 455/414.4  Applicant GENBAND INC.  1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  Box No. II Priority Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability citations and explanations supporting such statement  Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VI Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application General Peliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66 ibs(ft) that writen opinions of this International Searching Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66 ibs(ft) that writen opinions of this International Searching Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA as writen epilor logether, where approprises, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Forn PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further details, see notes to F	From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY				
JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P.A. SUITE 1200, UNIVERSITY TOWER 3100 TOWER BOULEVARD DURHAM, NC 27797	To:		PCT PCT		
SUITE 1200, UNIVERSITY TOWER 3100 TOWER BOULEVARD DURHAM, NC 27707    Date of mailing		,			
Applicant's or agent's file reference  Applicant's or agent's file reference  1497/38 PCT  International application No.  International application No.  PCT/US 07/26413  International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  IPC(8) - Horl L. 29/08 (2008.01)  USPC - 455/414.4  Applicant  GENBAND INC.  In This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  Box No. II Basis of the opinion  Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention  Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention  Box No. VI Certain documents cited  Box No. VI Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain deciets in the international application of the IPEA has notified the International Boreau under Rule 66. Ibix(b) that writer opinions of this international Searching Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority deter than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Boreau under Rule 66. Ibix(b) that writer opinions of this international Searching Authority will not be a considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit the Authority will not be a considered.  If this opinion is, as provided abo		۸.	WR	ITTEN OPINION OF THE	
Applicant's or agent's file reference  1497/38 PCT  International application No.  International papel case of the second part	3100 TOWER BOULEVARD				
Applicant's or agent's file reference  1497738 PCT  International application No.  International application No.  International filing date (day/month/year)  28 December 2007 (28.12.2007)  International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  IPC(8) - H011. 29/08 (2008.01)  INERNAND INC.  1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  Box No. II  Box No. II  Box No. III  Box No. III  Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability citations and explanations supporting such statement  Box No. VI  Certain documents cited  Box No. VI  Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the PEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the Inter	DURHAM, NC 27707			(DCT D.: 1- 421:- 1)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 1497/38 PCT International application No. PorT/US 07/26413  International platent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(9) - H011_29/08 (2008.01) USPC - 455/414.4  Applicant GENBAND INC.  I. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  Box No. II Basis of the opinion Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  If a demand for international Preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority vill not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions of this International Searching Authority vill not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions of this International Searching Autho				(PC1 Rule 43bis.1)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference 1497/38 PCT International application No. PorT/US 07/26413  International platent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(9) - H011_29/08 (2008.01) USPC - 455/414.4  Applicant GENBAND INC.  I. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  Box No. II Basis of the opinion Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  If a demand for international Preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority vill not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions of this International Searching Authority vill not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions of this International Searching Autho					
Applicant's or agent's file reference 1497/38 PCT International application No. PorT/US 07/26413  International platent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(9) - H011_29/08 (2008.01) USPC - 455/414.4  Applicant GENBAND INC.  I. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  Box No. II Basis of the opinion Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain defects in the international application  If a demand for international Preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority vill not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions of this International Searching Authority vill not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions of this International Searching Autho			Date of mailing		
1497/38 PCT   See paragraph 2 below				29 APR 2008	
1497/38 PCT   See paragraph 2 below	Applicant's or agent's file reference		FOR FURTHER A	CTION	
International application No. PCT/US 07/26413  International Patent Classification (PC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(8) - H011. 29/08 (2008.01) USPC - 455/414.4  Applicant GENBAND INC.  I. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:  Box No. I. Basis of the opinion Box No. II. Priority Box No. IV. Lack of unity of invention  Box No. IV. Lack of unity of invention  Box No. V. Reasoned statement under Rule 435is.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability, citations and explanations supporting such statement  Box No. VII. Certain documents cited Box No. VII. Certain defects in the international application Box No. VII. Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII. Certain defects in the international application Gradient of this International Searching Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written opinions, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Mail Stop PCT, Athr. ISA/US	-				
PCT/US 07/26413   28 December 2007 (28.12.2007)   28 December 2006 (28.12.2006)		filing date (	(dav/month/vear)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(8) - H01L 29/08 (2008.01)  USPC - 455/414.4  Applicant GENBAND INC.  1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:    Box No. I Basis of the opinion					
PC(8) - HO1L 29/08 (2008.01)   USPC - 455/414.4				,	
Section   Sect		classificati	ion and IPC		
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:    Box No. I   Basis of the opinion	USPC - 455/414.4				
Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion  Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young	Applicant GENBAND INC.				
Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion  Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young					
Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion  Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young					
Box No. II Priority Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion  Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young	1. This opinion contains indications relating to the follows:	owing item	is:		
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention  Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention  Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement  Box No. VI Certain documents cited  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion  Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young	Box No. I Basis of the opinion				
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention    Box No. V   Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement   Box No. VI   Certain documents cited   Box No. VII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII   Certain observations on the international application   Box No. VIII	Box No. II Priority	Box No. II Priority			
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement  Box No. VI Certain documents cited  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 before the expiration of 72 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Lea W. Young	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability				
citations and explanations supporting such statement  Box No. VI Certain documents cited  Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Mail Stop PCT, Athr. ISA/US  Lee W. Young	have and				
Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application  Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("PEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement				
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application  2. FURTHER ACTION  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US	Box No. VI Certain documents cited				
2. FURTHER ACTION  If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US  Date of completion of this opinion  Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young	Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application				
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US  Date of completion of this opinion  Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young	Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application				
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Lee W. Young	2 FURTHER ACTION				
International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US  Lee W. Young	If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the				
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Lee W. Young	International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written				
a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Lee W. Young	opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.				
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.  3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.  Name and mailing address of the ISA/US  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US  Lee W. Young	a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form				
Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Lee W. Young	l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e				
Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Date of completion of this opinion Authorized officer:  Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Lee W. Young					
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Lee W. Young	3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.				
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Lee W. Young					
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Lee W. Young	Name and mailing address of the ISA/IIS Date of comp	letion of th	us opinion	Authorized officer:	
Commissioner for Patents 2 April 2009 (02.04.2009)	Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US				
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300 PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300	Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  3 April 200	08 (03.04	1.2008)		

PCT Helpdesk: 571-272-4300 PCT OSP: 571-272-7774

Facsimile No. 571-273-3201

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US 07/26413

Box	No. I	Basis of this opinion
1.	-	egard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	X	the international application in the language in which it was filed.
		a translation of the international application into which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2.		This opinion has been established taking into account the <b>rectification of an obvious mistake</b> authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a))
3.		egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been shed on the basis of:
	a. typ	e of material
		a sequence listing
		table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b. for	mat of material
	느	on paper
	L.	in electronic form
	c. tim	e of filing/furnishing
	· [	contained in the international application as filed
	<u> </u>	_
	<u> </u>	filed together with the international application in electronic form
	L_	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
4.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
5.	Additie	onal comments:
	•	

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US 07/26413

Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	1-15	YES
• . ,	Claims	None	МО
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	None	YES
	Claims	1-15	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-15	YES
	Claims	None	NO NO

### Citations and explanations:

Claims 1, 2, 10, 11 and 15 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over US 2005/0084094 A1 to Gass et al. (hereinafter Gass) in view of US 2004/0110539 A1 to El-Maleh et al. (hereinafter El-Maleh '539).

As per claims 1, 10 and 15, Gass discloses system and a corresponding method and computer program using that system for silence insertion descriptor (SID) conversion (para. [0037]), the method comprising:

receiving a wireless frame (para. [0024]), the frame identifying a first node as a frame source and a second node as a frame destination (send/receive modules, MER, (para. [0034]);

determining whether the frame is a SID frame (para. [0041]); responsive to a determination that the frame is a SID frame, determining whether the SID format used by the first node is incompatible with the SID format used by the second node (determine if it is type I or type II, para. [0043]); and

responsive to a determination that the SID format used by the first node is incompatible with the SID format used by the second node, converting the frame from the SID format used by the first node to the SID format used by the second node and sending the converted SID frame to the second node (converting from type I to type II, para. [0050]).

Gass does not disclose determining whether tandem-free operation (TFO) is applicable; responsive to a determination that TFO is applicable, determining whether the frame is a SID frame.

However, El-Maleh '539 discloses determining whether tandem-free operation (TFO) is applicable; responsive to a determination that TFO is applicable, determining whether the frame is a SID frame (para. [0023]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine TFO applicability as taught by El-Maleh '539 in the method of Gass because to communicate using different types of wireless interfaces (El-Maleh '539: para. [0032]), thereby increasing communication interfacing efficiency and hence increasing the overall performance of the combined system.

As per claims 2 and 11, Gass in view of El-Maleh discloses the method and system as applied to claims 1 and 10, above. El-Maleh '539 further disclose that determining whether TFO is applicable includes determining whether a speech compression algorithm and data rate used by the first node is the same as a speech compression algorithm and data rate used by the second node (para. [0007]-[0008]).

Claims 6-8 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Gass in view of US 2001/0043577 A1 to Barany et al. (hereinafter Barany).

As per claim 6, Gass discloses system and a corresponding method and computer program using that system for silence insertion descriptor (SID) conversion (para. [0037]), the method comprising:

descriptor (SID) conversion (para. [0037]), the method comprising: receiving a wireless frame (para. [0024]), the frame identifying a first node as a frame source and a second node as a frame destination (send/receive modules, MER, (para. [0034]); identifying a first codec used by the first node and a second codec used by the second node (); determining whether the frame is a SID frame (para. [0041]); responsive to a determination that the frame is a SID frame, determining whether the SID format used by the second node (determine if it is type I or type II, para. [0043]); and responsive to a determination that the SID format used by the first node is incompatible with the SID format used by the second node, converting the frame from the SID format used by the first node to the SID format used by the second node and sending the converted SID frame to the second node (converting from type I to type II, para. [00501). SID frame to the second node (converting from type I to type II, para. [0050]).

Gass does not disclose: determining whether one of the first and second codecs comprises a second generation global system for mobile enhanced full rate (2G\_GSM\_EFR) codec and the other of the first and second codecs comprises a third generation global system for mobile enhanced full rate (3G\_GSM\_EFR) codec; responsive to a determination that the codecs comprise a 2G\_GSM\_EFR codec and a 3G GSM EFR codec, determining whether the frame is a SID frame.

However Barany discloses a method including: determining whether one of the first and second codecs comprises a second generation global system for mobile enhanced full rate (2G\_GSM\_EFR) codec and the other of the first and second codecs comprises a third generation global system for mobile enhanced full rate 3G\_GSM\_EFR) codec (para. [0131], [0133]); responsive to a determination that the codecs comprise a 2G\_GSM\_EFR codec and a 3G\_GSM\_EFR codec, determining whether he frame is a SID frame (para. [0131], [0131]). [0133]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine if the frame is for a 2G network or for a 3G network as taught by Barany, in the method of Gass because to allow for interfacing between the 2G networks and 3G networks (Barany: para. [0131]), thereby increasing communication interfacing efficiency and hence increasing the overperformance of the combined system.

(See Supplemental Box)

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US 07/26413

#### Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Box No. V — Reasoned Statement

2. Citations and Explanations:

As per claims 7 and 8, Barany further discloses determining whether the input frame is a SID frame includes determining, based on the contents of a frame index field indicator, whether the input frame is a SID frame for a third generation (3G) network or whether the input frame is a SID frame for a second generation (2G) network (para. [0131], [0133]).

Claims 3, 4, 12 and 13 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Gass in view of El-Maleh '539 as applied above, and further in view of Barany.

As per claims 3, 4, 12 and 13, Gass in view of El-Maleh '539 discloses the method and system as applied to claims 1 and 10, above, but does not disclose that determining whether the input frame is a SID frame includes determining, based on the contents of a frame index field indicator, whether the input frame is a SID frame for a third generation (3G) network or whether the input frame is a SID frame for a second generation (2G) network. However, Barany discloses determining whether the input frame is a SID frame includes determining, based on the contents of a frame index field indicator, whether the input frame is a SID frame for a third generation (3G) network or whether the input frame is a SID frame for a second generation (2G) network (para. [0131], [0133]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine if the frame is for a 2G network or for a 3G network as taught by Barany, in the combined teachings of Gass and El-Maleh '539 because to allow for interfacing between the 2G networks and 3G networks (Barany: para. [0131]), thereby increasing communication interfacing efficiency and hence increasing the overall performance of the combined system.

Claims 5 and 14 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Gass in view of El-Maleh '539 as applied above, and further in view of US 2004/0133419 A1 to El-Maleh et al. (hereinafter El-Maleh '419).

As per claims 5 and 14, Gass in view of El-Maleh '539 discloses the method and system as applied to claims 1 and 10, above, but does not disclose that converting the SID frame includes: locating line spectral frequency information and energy gain information within the frame; extracting the line spectral frequency and energy gain information from the frame; and generating, as the converted SID frame, a wireless frame of the SID format used by the second node and containing the extracted line spectral frequency and energy gain information.

However, El-Maleh '419 discloses a method of wherein converting the SID frame includes:

locating line spectral frequency information and energy gain information within the frame (spectral parameters and energy gain values,

extracting the line spectral frequency and energy gain information from the frame (para. [0028]); and

generating, as the converted SID frame, a wireless frame of the SID format used by the second node and containing the extracted line spectral frequency and energy gain information (para. [0028], generating a SID frame also known as comfort noise).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine spectral parameters and energy gain values as taught by El-Maleh '419, in the combined teachings of Gass and El-Maleh '539 because to generate comfort noise (El-Maleh '419: para. [0028]), thereby increasing communication interfacing efficiency and hence increasing the overall performance of the combined system.

Claim 9 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Gass in view of Barany as applied above, and further in view of El-Maleh '419.

As per claim 9, Gass in view of El- Barany discloses the method as applied to claim 6, above, but does not disclose that converting the SID frame includes: locating line spectral frequency information and energy gain information within the frame; extracting the line spectral frequency and energy gain information from the frame; and generating, as the converted SID frame, a wireless frame of the SID format used by the second node and containing the extracted line spectral frequency and energy gain information.

However, El-Maleh '419 discloses a method of wherein converting the SID frame includes:

locating line spectral frequency information and energy gain information within the frame (spectral parameters and energy gain values, para. [0028]);

extracting the line spectral frequency and energy gain information from the frame (para. [0028]); and generated, as the converted SID frame, a wireless frame of the SID format used by the second node and containing the extracted line spectral frequency and energy gain information (para. [0028], generating a SID frame also known as comfort noise).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine spectral parameters and energy gain values as taught by El-Maleh '419, in the combined teachings of Gass and Barany because to generate comfort noise (El-Maleh '419: para. [0028]), thereby increasing communication interfacing efficiency and hence increasing the overall performance of the combined system.

Claims 1-15 have industrial applicability as defined by PCT Article 33(4) because the subject matter cclaimed can be made or used in industry.